

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/227,350 | NISHIUMI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | David L. Lewis | 2673 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) David L. Lewis.

(3) _____.

 (2) Willaim G. Niessen (29, 683).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103(a) - Garrido (5451053) in view of Ho (5259626), Marcus (5643087), and Ishiwata (4870389)

Claims discussed:

11, 19, 27 and 29

Prior art documents discussed:

Garrido (5451053) in view of Ho (5259626), Marcus (5643087), and Ishiwata (4870389)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 11 and 19 would be allowable if Applicant filed a Terminal Disclaimer over US Patents 6244959 and 6239806, and independent claim 27 would be allowable if amended to include the subject matter concerning speed as the motion characteristic as found in claims 11 and 19. The rejection over Garrido, Ho, Marcus, and Ishiwata, fails to properly teach the claimed invention as argued by the applicant.